



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/579,258	05/11/2006	Wolf-Dieter Wichmann	5000.P0098US	6585

23474 7590 03/17/2009  
FLYNN THIEL BOUTELL & TANIS, P.C.  
2026 RAMBLING ROAD  
KALAMAZOO, MI 49008-1631

EXAMINER
----------

MCGRAW, TREVOR EDWIN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3752

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

03/17/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/579,258		<b>Applicant(s)</b> WICHMANN, WOLF-DIETER	
	<b>Examiner</b> Trevor E. McGraw		<b>Art Unit</b> 3752	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Trevor E. McGraw. (3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Mr. Don Wallace. (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 11 March 2009.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: N/A.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-11.

Identification of prior art discussed: Chaplinsky and Knight.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Mr. Wallace explained how the present invention differed from the applied prior art references in regard to how the purge lines operate (e.g. product being forced back into the product container). Examiner acknowledged Mr. Wallace's explanation and suggested that Mr. Wallace present the discussed items in the remarks for response detailing the purging process of the present invention

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/T. E. M./ Examiner, Art Unit 3752	/Len Tran/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3752
---------------------------------------	--